

PART IV – REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.1 PROPOSAL EVALUATION – GENERAL..... 1

M.2 BASIS FOR AWARD..... 2

**M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION
CRITERIA..... 3**

M.4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA 3

M.5 PRICE EVALUATION 5

M.6 FAR 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990) 6

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 PROPOSAL EVALUATION – GENERAL

- (a) This acquisition will be conducted pursuant to the policies and procedures in FAR Part 15, and DEAR Part 915. DOE has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate the proposals submitted for this acquisition. Proposals will be evaluated by the SEB members in accordance with the procedures contained in FAR Part 15, DEAR Part 915, and the Evaluation Factors hereinafter described. The Source Selection Official (SSO) will select an Offeror for contract award using the best value analysis described in this section.
- (b) The instructions set forth in Section L are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the documentation that must be provided in the Offeror's proposal. The Offeror must furnish adequate and specific information in its proposal response. Cursory proposal responses that merely repeat or reformulate the Performance Work Statement are not acceptable. Further, a proposal will be eliminated from consideration before the evaluation if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. For example, a proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable effort to address itself to the essential requirements of the Request for Proposal (RFP), or if it clearly demonstrates that the Offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP. A proposal will also be eliminated from further consideration before the evaluation if the Offeror is not able to recertify that they do not exceed the small business size standard of \$35.5M under NAICS code 561210, Facilities Support Services, at the time proposals are due. In the event a proposal is rejected, a notice will be sent to the Offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.
- (c) The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award one contract without discussions or exchanges with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). If a competitive range is established pursuant to FAR 15.306(c), Offerors are hereby advised that only the most highly rated proposals deemed to have a reasonable chance for award of a contract may be included in the competitive range. Offerors that are not included in the competitive range will be promptly notified. Therefore, the Offeror's proposal shall contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer (CO) later determines them to be necessary.
- (d) Prior to award, a determination will be made regarding whether any possible Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) exist with respect to the apparent successful Offeror or whether there is little or no likelihood that such conflict exists. In making this determination, the CO will consider the representation required by

Section K of this solicitation. An award will be made if there is no OCI or if any potential OCI can be appropriately avoided or mitigated.

- (e) Any exceptions or deviations by the Offeror to the terms and conditions stated in this solicitation for inclusion in the resulting Contract may make the offer unacceptable for award without discussions. If an Offeror proposes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the Contract, the Government may make an award without discussions to another Offeror that did not take exception to the terms and conditions of the Contract.
- (f) Any proposal found to have a deficiency in meeting the stated solicitation requirements or performance objectives will be considered ineligible for award, unless the deficiency is corrected through discussions.

M.2 BASIS FOR AWARD

- (a) The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the Contract; to negotiate with offerors in the competitive range; and to award the Contract to the Offeror submitting the proposal determined to represent the best value – the proposal most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.
- (b) The tradeoff process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition. The Government considers it to be in its best interest to allow consideration of award to other than the lowest priced Offeror or other than the highest technically rated Offeror.
- (c) In determining the best value to the Government, the Technical Evaluation Criteria, when combined, are more important than the evaluated price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a proposal with superior technical merit than making a selection at the lowest evaluated price. Thus, the closer or more similar in merit that the Offerors' technical proposals are evaluated to be, the more likely the evaluated price may be the determining factor in selection for award. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium that it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the higher technical merit.
- (d) Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through the following:
 - (1) The Government will assign adjectival ratings for each of the Technical Evaluation Criterion specified in Section M.4, Technical Evaluation Criteria. The assigned adjectival ratings for Criterion 2 and 3 will be based on any evaluated significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, weaknesses and deficiencies identified in each Contractor's proposal for Criterion 2 and 3. The assigned adjectival rating for Criterion 1 will be based on the favorability of each Contractor's relevant past performance information.

- (2) The Government will assess whether the strengths and weaknesses and relevant past performance information between or among competing technical proposals indicates a superiority from the standpoint of: (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated price to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference.

M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated on the technical evaluation criteria below:

- Criterion 1 – Past Performance
- Criterion 2 – Technical and Management Approach
- Criterion 3 – Relevant Experience

Criterion 1 and Criterion 2 are equal in importance and are each significantly more important than Criterion 3. Areas within an evaluation criterion are not sub-criteria and will not be individually rated, but will be considered in the overall evaluation for that particular evaluation criterion.

M.4 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criterion 1: Past Performance

DOE will evaluate the past performance of the Offeror, including any entity comprising the teaming arrangement thereof as defined by FAR 9.601, and major subcontractor(s) for contracts, task orders, or projects currently on-going or completed within the last five (5) years and that encompasses work similar in size, scope and complexity to the PWS. Size is defined as dollar value and duration. Scope is defined as the type of work (e.g., Grounds Maintenance, Training, Computing and Telecommunications, Personnel Security and Cyber Security, and Radiological Site Services). Complexity is defined as performance challenges (e.g. performing under a firm-fixed-price environment, types of road repairs, types of facilities, industrial hazards and interfaces with DOE and other government contractors). DOE will also consider the Offeror's written discussion of past performance problems and the corrective actions taken to resolve those problems.

DOE will consider past performance information submitted by the Offeror on the Attachment L-3, Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form, and information submitted by the Offeror's references on Attachment L-4, Past Performance Questionnaire (where applicable for non-DOE Office of Environmental Management work and where a PPIRS record is not available). In addition, DOE may evaluate any other information obtained through the available Federal Government electronic databases, readily available Government records, and sources other than those identified by the Contractor. Contract references, including those identified by the Offeror on Attachment L-3 and Attachment L-4 and those not identified by the Offeror,

but listed in E-government databases, may be contacted and for information to used in past performance evaluation.

The higher the degree of relevance of the work described to the PWS, the greater the consideration that may be given. Additionally, more recent relevant past performance information may also be given greater consideration. Any work performed for DOE's Office of Environmental Management will be considered to be at least Somewhat Relevant. In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on relevant past performance is not available, the Offeror will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

Criterion 2: Technical and Management Approach

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach to transition activities, including the process and planned activities for conducting a safe, orderly transition; minimizing impacts on continuity of operations; identifying key issues that may arise during transition and resolutions; and planned interactions with DOE, the incumbent Contractor, incumbent employees, and other site Contractors.

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposed technical approach for depth, quality, completeness, and effectiveness; as well as the Offeror's understanding of and ability to perform the firm-fixed-price elements of the PWS, to include management and administration functions, in a fixed price environment.

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's three most significant identified risks to successful performance of the PWS in a fixed price environment; the Offeror's rationale for the identified risks and their potential impacts; and the Offeror's approach to eliminating, avoiding, or mitigating the three most significant risks. DOE will evaluate only the first three risks identified by the Offeror.

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposed management approach, including the efficiency and effectiveness of its proposed organizational breakdown structure to accomplish the PWS and the benefits of its use of subcontracting or teaming arrangements (if any). This also includes the Offeror's management approach to the variability in workload and work surges; and their understanding of and approach to interfacing with other site contractors, service providers, and site-wide programs providing integrated safety management and an effective safety culture.

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's staffing plan to demonstrate the ability to obtain, retain, and maintain the breadth and depth of qualified staff to safely and effectively perform all elements of the PWS. DOE will also evaluate the completed Attachment L-6, Labor Categories and Full-Time Equivalents, for the total effort to include the prime Contractor and all subcontractors for the Base and Option Periods.

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's rationale for its designation of the Key Personnel positions relative to the approach to the management and execution of the work proposed. The evaluation of the Offeror's rationale will include an assessment as to whether the Offeror has proposed the appropriate key personnel team along with the appropriate mix of key personnel positions and skills for successful Contract performance. DOE will evaluate the relevant qualifications and experience of the Offeror's proposed Key Personnel for executing this Contract. The Key Personnel will be evaluated for suitability for the proposed position(s) based on demonstrated leadership; demonstrated experience in performing work similar to that described in the PWS; and qualifications (e.g. education, certifications, licenses) as presented in the resumes. In evaluating the Key Personnel, the Project Manager will be considered more important than the other Key Personnel position(s). Failure to propose, at a minimum, a Project Manager and a Security Manager will result in the Offeror's proposal being excluded from further consideration.

Offerors are advised that DOE may contact references and previous employers to verify the accuracy of resume information and further assess the leadership, experience, and qualifications of Key Personnel.

Failure to submit a Letter of Commitment from the Key Personnel and to provide resumes in the specified format may result in a lower evaluation rating for this criterion or the Offeror's proposal being eliminated from further consideration for award.

Failure to propose, at a minimum, a Project Manager and a Security Manager will result in the Offeror's proposal being excluded from further consideration.

Criterion 3: Relevant Experience

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's, including any entity comprising the teaming arrangement thereof, as defined by FAR 9.601, and the Offeror's major subcontractor(s), relevant experience in performing work similar in size, scope and complexity to the functions of the PWS that the entity is being proposed to perform. DOE will evaluate the relevant experience of the Offeror, including any entity comprising the teaming arrangement thereof, as defined by FAR 9.601, and the Offeror's major subcontractor(s) for the same contracts, task orders, or projects referenced for past performance information on Attachment L-3, Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form. DOE will evaluate the demonstrated relevancy of the work performed to the PWS requirements including any improvements implemented in the performance of the work.

M.5 PRICE EVALUATION

The Contractor's proposed price will not be point scored or adjectivally rated, but will be evaluated to assess price reasonableness and completeness. The Government will evaluate price based on the total proposed price, including basic requirements and all

Paducah Infrastructure Support Services
Draft Request for Proposal
DE-SOL-0006383

option items included in Section B. The total evaluated price will be equal to the total proposed price for Firm-Fixed-Price CLINs (including the Fixed Unit Rate CLINs) (Section B), the total estimated cost for the Cost Reimbursement CLINs (Section B), and the total price of all ELINs under the IDIQ CLINs (Section J) for the base period and all option periods.

The Government will evaluate all options and has included the provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options, in Section M of the solicitation. In accordance with FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options, this does not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

For the Firm-Fixed-Price CLINs and IDIQ ELINs, price analysis will be performed.

M.6 FAR 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).